DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 702 HE 013 190

AUTHOR Moore, Hollis: And Others
TITLE Defining Leadership. AAUSCU Studies-1980-No. 3.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 ($2.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; *College Presidents; *Educational Benefits; Educational Philosophy; General Education; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Responsibility; Liberal Arts; *Retrenchment; State Colleges; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS Institutional Advancement; *Time Management

ABSTRACT

Four essays address the issue of leadership in higher education institutions. "Leadership: The Presidential Imperative," by Hollis Moore, discusses the need and the ability of college presidents to exercise the considerable influence they possess. It is noted that perhaps the greatest danger today is that administrators feel so buffeted by various demands and events that they may fail to use that influence, and may react more than act. In "General Educational Reform," by Peter Diamandopolis, the issue addressed is: what philosophy of general education and concept of liberal arts and sciences best suits the efforts of college presidents in accepting leadership responsibility. Discussed are areas in which to seek advice and enlightenment, and problems that show the utility and value of general education. The focus of "The Condition of Advancement in State Colleges and Universities," by James L. Fisher, is institutions learning how to "shrink creatively" in the near future: that is, using a combination of sound academic programs and presidential awareness and sophistication in institutional advancement activities in order to succeed. The final essay, "A Systematic Approach to Self/Unit/Organization Time Management," by Lee H. Smith, is a condensation of a two-session seminar. In it individuals are encouraged to develop a time management philosophy in real settings. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED192702

Defining Leadership

Hollis Moore
Peter Diamandoupolis
James L. Fisher
Lee H. Smith

AASCU Studies—1980—No. 3

Published by the American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

Allan W. Ostar, President
Sandra K. Ralston, Editor

Library of Congress No. 80-69424

August 1980

HE013190

Copyright, American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword 1

Leadership: The Presidential Imperative 3
Hollis Moore

General Educational Reform 11
Peter Diamandoupolis

The Condition of Advancement In State Colleges and Universities 21
James L. Fisher

A Systematic Approach To Self/Unit/Organization Time Management 33
Lee H. Smith

Foreword

As an acknowledged factor in the success of an enterprise, leadership is a frequent topic of management writings. Yet, the nature of leadership eludes precise descriptions, definitive characteristics, and other normative formulations. How then does one address the current leadership requirements for public colleges and universities?

The four papers in this publication address the quality of leadership as it is mirrored in positive movements in the institutional environment, actions and attitude changes which contribute to the mission and goals of the institution. The authors posit the importance of institutional leadership in terms of the roles that must be assumed and the issues that must be addressed to drive the institution forward. Leadership thus is affirmed in the relationship with state government officials, alumni, faculty, and donors; in the efficiency of management philosophy; and in the preservation of academic quality.

The papers were adapted from presentations made during AASCU's Biennial Summer Council of Presidents in Castine, Maine, August 1979. The Summer Council is structured around the professional development needs of presidents and chancellors.

Leadership: The Presidential Imperative

Hollis Moore

Currently there is a wide concern for the concept of leadership. It may be a fad—but it also may underly many events in education in recent years. It may be that those education leaders and college presidents in the 1960s who were creative and innovative were working within the concept of leadership. Those who mediated and softened the student protests in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as well as those who engaged in sophisticated planning techniques and better management undertakings in the 1970s may have been involved in it. In fact, those who are at present engaged in ways to market their institutions may be working within this framework, too. Certainly, in each of these phases there has been interest in leadership both as a concept and as a way of operating.

College and university presidents do possess and can exercise considerable influence. Perhaps the greatest danger today is that because we feel so buffeted by various demands and events, we may fail to exercise the kind of influence we do have, may fail to generate that extra spark, may react more than act.

Crisis of Confidence

This summer leadership as a concept has become a national preoccupation. President Carter has been asking himself at Camp David what leadership is all about and examining such phrases as "take charge," "be bold'" and "crisis of confidence." We have no problem in translating this examination into our own situations.

The leadership literature often preaches, is obscure, and contains some of the worst of behavioral science writing. However, there is a most attractive—to me—book on the topic which recently came out: it is by James MacGregor Burns and titled *Leadership.*[1] Many of the ideas in it apply to any number of areas of leadership. President Carter has had several meetings with Professor Burns in the past few weeks.

What I think is perhaps Burn's most telling contribution to the literature of leadership is in telling us that conflict within our institutions is not merely to be endured; rather it is to be coveted in terms of giving us the opportunity to use it, for it is the only way in which we can get a dynamic attention to our problems and to our solutions. What we don't want to do is to fill our administrative cabinets or our councils with only the people who agree with us. It is an excellent and eloquent book, produced by one of our major scholars in the country, and it demonstrates that we have a national preoccupation at the moment with leadership style, with the concept of leadership.

A New Leadership Style

We have, I think, persuaded ourselves almost universally that we are ready to discard the imperial style of presidency of leadership, which evolved prior

Hollis Moore is president of Bowling Green State University, Ohio

to President Carter. This same may be true at the institutional as well as the national level. We're seeing the development of a style of leadership at the national level which will be worthy of our analysis, for purposes other than just for casting our vote sometime next year. I hardly can imagine any other president of the United States in my lifetime going on television and talking about comments made to him, in a self-analysis of his own style, his own leadership potential. We have a lot of empathy for people who reveal their weaknesses; but the question of whether we follow people who do remains.

A recent newspaper headline said, "President Can Offer Inspiration But Not Magic." Maybe we should take that headline home and put it in our own newspapers so that there would be less expectation for magic—for the same is obviously true of university presidents. I think we all agree that one of our greatest problems seems to be the same kind of problem that we are seeing at the national level: confidence—in terms of the future of the institution and in terms of whether we really are going to be able to improve things.

I think we are more obsessed now with some of the negative aspects of our jobs, and it seems to me this is the same thing we see on the national level. As we reached the middle of the century, we asked people to project what life was going to be like in the United States by the end of the century and at the beginning of the next. All kinds of exciting and imaginative proposals came out which had an underlying optimism; but now, as we begin to test this out and ask people the same questions again, we get very, very negative responses. I know we've seen this at our own institutions. I don't know whether it's a reflection of the national situation, or whether it grows out of special problems at our own institutions; but there are some parallels between the climate needed for leadership at the national level and at the university level.

We seem to want now stronger, more perceptive, more ingenious, bolder leaders. We get frequent references in the press to previous leaders, like Lincoln, who united the country at a time of crisis. I hope people haven't entirely forgotten that nobody paid much attention to a little speech of Lincoln's at Gettysburg when he made it. However, as we look back on it, we admire that kind of leadership. And it may be that every now and then, if you listen in to conversations of the oldtimers on your campuses, you hear them talking about people two presidencies before yours and some of the changes in leadership in this same way. Just as political party loyalty has diminished in recent years, I think institutional loyalty has, too.

I'm also sure that most of us would tell Mr. Carter that a faculty senate can be just as intractable as Congress, so that we could say to him we understand some of his problems. By the way, James MacGregor Burns emphasizes, in regard to university leadership, that one of the things we need most on our campuses is some conflict within the faculty groups. He says that the fact that you have a single faculty senate means that the kind of compromise and amelioration of position that you would get if you had more than one group representing the faculty is left out. However, to suggest that we should have two faculty senates is like suggesting that we should have two medical schools—and most of us would not want that.

Cynicism and Disenchantment

A mood of cynicism prevails nationally, fueled by Three Mile Island, inflation, and the fuel shortage. There is similar disenchantment on our cam-

puses about the mission of the institution, the nature of the students we are getting now, and the programs we have. As attention at the national level is focused quickly on nonevents, the symbolic gestures, the same thing carries over to our own institutions. It is easy to cite examples of incidents that are relatively insignificant that were blown up all out of proportion as symbols of mismanagement.

The Bureaucratic Response

This crisis of confidence, this desire for bold, imaginative geniuses for leaders, this cynicism which is part of our national picture, are all reflected on our campuses. What kinds of responses do we make?

One response that is made all too frequently for my taste is the bureaucratic response: seeking another organization, another bureau, another way of reorganizing affairs, to solve all our problems. It's so easy for us, inundated as we are with committee reports and correspondence, to put off into a bureaucratic framework many of the decisions that are important. Bureaucracy is frequently our security blanket, our backup to help us out of some of our problems. Bureaucracy is a state of mind, in a way. But I think it is tremendously important for us to try to forego the bureaucratic response, though it is not easy.

Defining Leadership

I'd like to turn now to a definition of leadership that may be more useful to us. James MacGregor Burns sees leadership over human beings being "exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers."[2] Burns feels that the genius of leadership is in the manner with which the leaders see and act on their own and their followers motives and values. He looks at power as one of the things we use; but there is a difference between exercising power and exercising leadership. He emphasizes that meaningful conflict, which we could utilize in our institutions, would generate motive, sharpen demands, and strengthen values at our institutions.

One other way to look at a definition of leadership—and unfortunately the literature is not overwhelmed with this—is through descriptions of the way different people in our university presidencies have approached this job. A few months ago *Change* Magazine carried an article which contrasted the way several presidents exercise leadership and how this is perceived by some of the people in their institutions. One of the more telling comments was that during one president's tenure the vice presidents spent at least 50 percent of their time trying to figure out how to manage the president instead of how to manage the university.

Leadership is now more often defined in terms of skills needed to wind down the present level of operations and adjust to the new reality. I'm sure all of us are looking at that inside our own institutions. At the national level we're talking about reducing energy usage and changing lifestyles and standards of living. On campus we're talking about faculty and staff retrenchment, redeveloping and retooling people in some areas, finding use for unoccupied residence halls and classrooms, and dropping certain programs. All of these things cause us to ask for particularly strong presidential leadership, nationally

as well as on campus. However, you have to realize that to most of the people on the faculty "strong" means they want you to be a lion in external affairs and a lamb in matters of internal management. Somehow or other, we try to accomplish both these things at the same time.

Mission Madness

Some of you may have noticed the article in last week's *Chronicle* called "Mission Madness Strikes the Campuses." I think this is something coming for many of our institutions—I know it is at my own. People are taking a vague desire for more leadership and saying that what we really want is for someone to strike out in some new direction, spell out for us where we are going to go, and give us not only a unique mission for our own institution but also the goals we can accomplish along the way—so that we can check those off and know when we've reached them. This means we must move into the laborious exercise of establishing advisory committees and so on to the point where we spell out and put into print in our catalogue and elsewhere our mission statement. It also means we may be in trouble when we do not meet our mission and goals. I think this is just a current fad.

Mission and Goal Statements

One of the reasons I do is that if you look at samples of mission statements in, for example, three different catalogues from three very different types of institutions and read them without knowing what institutions they are and try to match the mission statements with the institutions, you will find it's pretty hard to do. It's unusual to find a really unique mission for any one of our institutions, a mission so different that we can spell it out in a catalogue, so clear-cut that we will know when we accomplish it. However, I think we may be pushed into trying this, unless we already have been pushed into a so called exigency study or the like. By the way, I think this sort of study is sheer dynamite. Anticipation of unpleasant decisions is much worse than the carrying out of unpleasant decisions. Anticipation lasts over a long period of time, and your faculty may project themselves more negatively than they actually will turn out to be. As a result, I think these studies-to-come on missions and exigencies are going to be extremely troublesome.

Goal statements are a little more sophisticated, but I think the task may be the same kind. I'm not saying that it's not possible to say what your college or university is all about, or what some of your goals are; but for the president to take it on as a personal task to lay out these goals will be a difficult task which involves touchy issues. I think we have to recognize that our missions are shared with many other institutions, and to try and pursue the unique is foolish, particularly when retrenchment that has the potential to damage the personal security of some of the people on our campuses is involved.

Contrasting Mission, Goals, and Vision

I'd like to wrap up this subtopic on the tender trap of the mission statement—or mission madness, as the *Chronicle* calls it by saying that I think the president of an institution has an obligation to spell out as clearly as possible what his or her vision of the university is. This is somewhat different than spelling out the specifics of either a unique mission or special goals. As I

reflect on my own situation, on our own current problems, it seems to me that periodically—and with a great deal of care and decision—I have the obligation to spell out the vision of the university. It is not the same sort of statement that is in our catalogues, and it is not risk free. I know that often we observe that we really don't solve our problems—we trade them in for problems we like better and call it progress.

Ambition and Restraint

I believe that in the university we have to recognize that there is on one hand an ambitious reach in every single part of the university that gives our universities and colleges their vitality—and lends hope and promise to the enterprise. And this reach is forever going to exceed the grasp. On the other hand it is restraint in the exercise of power and influence, in our presidential office in particular, that fuels the sense of sharing. These two elements together, ambition mixed with restraint, make a volatile compound which is absolutely essential in our institutions.

Today it seems to me I'm seeing the restraint but less of the ambition, less of the forward motion, because of the characteristics of our time and the problems universities face. Whereas unchecked ambition invites secular parochialism, the excess of restraint means passive conformity; and I think the latter is the greater danger today though the former may have been the greater danger a dozen years ago.

What I really argue for here is a reasonable balance, a precarious balance to be sure—but otherwise the university won't move forward. And it can move. It may lurch and wobble and falter and hesitate, but it can move in the way in which we want it to move if we take this approach between ambition and restraint.

The Heart of the Institution

I am also concerned about one other thing in our institutions in relation to mission, and that is that while we are concerned today about financial management, we must also be concerned about what kind of an institution we have, with the heart of the institution as well as its head. It's not merely intellectual problems that have unraveled great institutions of learning but lack of participation in moral consensus, concern, and community.

My institution may be unusual, but toward the end of this past year it looked as if a mild return to the student unrest of the late 1960s was surfacing. What it really was, I think, was an absence of civility and mutual respect—an absence that is fairly common in our society today and which is reflected on our campuses. Our students, our graduates, are at the present time a lot smarter than when they came to us. But I don't think they are as loving as they ought to be, and this is part of my concern about the vision of the institution.

We have a strident in our society generally, an absence of stability—which may have been maintained at one time in our past through artificial restrictions on behavior (like the yes, ma'am and no, ma'am I grew up with in west Texas) but which must be returned to in some degree. I think this is absolutely essential. I believe part of our leadership role is to get beyond the purely academic and look at the kinds of people that our students are when they leave our institutions.

In the next few years I think we will see some strong efforts on the part of some of the women's groups. I think these efforts will be appropriate, for many of the things that happen on our campuses are genuinely sexist and obnoxious to the women on our faculties and in our student bodies. Again, it is a matter of respect, not just for the rights of other people but for their sensitivities as well. We can manage our institutions so that we respect people's rights, and even their property; but a genuine concern today is to ensure respect for sensitivities.

Obligations of Leadership

I think we're entering an era in which our behaviour as presidents, in which the leadership spark that I think we can give these institutions, will affect our institutions for a good many years. We have three or four really strong obligations. These are not brand new, but I think they are a lot more important today than they have been in the past.

Sustain vitality—The first one of these obligations is the most important of all, and that is to sustain vitality in our institutions. We can't have the same kind of a sense of vitality and energy that we had at the time we had a growth picture both in terms numbers of people and dollars. But each person, each institution, can take on a different view. I believe that a sense of vitality is tremendously important, and I see this slipping away in terms of many of the people to whom I talk.

Follow fairness and equity—Second, because we are going to be making some extremely unpopular and tough decisions, I think we have a greater obligation than ever to follow fairness and equity in making those decisions. We already know, because of the nature of our jobs, that there is no other age group in our society so concerned about the unfair, the person who does you in, the person who is just a little bit shady, than the late teenager. But fairness is for everyone—our staff, our faculty, and all the rest. We're going to have to prove that we really know how to achieve fairness, and we're going to have to follow this as a guiding principle even though it may be very tough.

Preserve quality—Third, I think that however you define quality in your institution, we're going to have to work harder than any of our predecessors so that it does not become a casuality in the next dozen years. I see some erosion already happening in decisions about admissions, programs, and retention of students. However, people are not going to think very kindly about us if they look back on our administrations and see that we let quality become a casualty. It is a dangerous situation today.

Understand symbolic behavior—I think that you and I have an obligation on our campuses to keep faces from getting longer as resources become shorter. Our institutions have to be good places to be, where we can even have a little fun every now and then. I think we can ensure this by how we act. Most of us have not been popularly elected to our jobs nor have we been out in the political arena, so we may not understand symbols—or power—as well as the political leader does. But we're learning, and a lot of what we do in terms of the mood of the campus, in terms of faces with a smile on them occasionally, has to do with the way in which we handle symbols. It's an area we need to work on, because the going is going to get pretty tough.

Avoid temporarily helpful patterns—Fifth, and finally, I think we have to avoid, both at the state, institutional, and perhaps national levels, falling into new organizational patterns which may help us just a bit temporarily but which will be very harmful in the long run. I think a lot of institutional independence and autonomy has been sacrificed over the past few years, with bothersome results. We may be again today looking at ways in which we can get together, organize, and get help from outside sources to bail us out temporarily—but in the long run this is not going to help our institutions because some of these decisions will be as difficult to turn back as they are easy to propose at the present.

Exerting Our Influence as Leaders

How do we exert our influence as leaders? For me, the first thing is to clarify what my own personal goals are. This means that in some of our rare quite moments we need to clarify ourselves. Second, we ought to decide who it is we are really seeking to lead, who is in that constituency out there. Third, we have to determine where it is we are trying to go. Fourth, we have to discover how we can overcome the obstacles that face us in order to realize our goals.

I think the function of leadership is to engage the people within our institutions—not merely to activate them, but to engage them and to commingle needs and aspirations, theirs, ours, mine, yours. It is a common enterprise which in the process should make better citizens out of all of us. I believe that the shape of higher education for some time into the new century is going to be affected very significantly by the way you and I respond, by the way we perform as leaders in the years just ahead.

References

1. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).
2. Ibid., p. 18.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Peter Diamandoupolis

Because of our role as educators, and with our responsibility as presidents to accept leadership, we cannot skirt the issue of what philosophy of general education and concept of liberal arts and sciences best suits our efforts.

The literature on the subject is vast: the Carnegie reports, education policy committee meetings across the country, and philosophies from Plato to Whitehead make the topic of general education and liberal arts appear either hopelessly confused or thoroughly controversial. However, the practices of academic institutions fall very short of what we could do—and what is desperately needed. Therefore, it seems to me that we are confronted with the imperative to make up our own minds as to what the challenges of general education and the liberal arts are—in a very straightforward and simple way—and then make some determination as to what practical steps we can take to make a reasonable philosophy of liberal arts and general education part of each of our institutions.

I approach the problem as a historian, and I look at the difficulties as a pedagogue. I also think we can be serious about certain things without being ponderous. With this in mind, I want to advance some general considerations in four steps.

The first step will describe the present state of perceptions on general education and the liberal arts, and of concepts we allude to throughout our daily activities, professional meetings, and institutional matters. In the second step I want to discuss the areas where we might seek advice, counsel, and enlightenment for overcoming the problems surrounding the whole concept of liberal arts. For example, should we seek advice in divine inspiration, social practice, other academies, or in popular perceptions and the media? The third step is to ask what kinds of problems can show us, as quickly as possible, the utility of liberal arts education and the value of general education; that is, what are the payoffs? The last step, after we have discovered where to seek enlightenment and ascertained payoffs, is to find out what strategies we must follow; that is, what educational policy must we foster in our respective institutions to ensure that our institutions are aiming at something that can be delivered, that what we advertise is marketable, and that our "customers" leave us with a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction?

These four steps will give us, I hope, a reasonable approach to the state of confusion concerning general education and the liberal arts, the search for enlightenment, the cluster of problems that may show the utility and payoffs of this kind of education, and some strategies. There are many other possible approaches, but this one should be useful. However, it should be kept in mind that in situations like these which confront us as educators and leaders in educational policy, we have to have clear and distinct ideas—to use Rene Descarte's famous enjoining.

Peter Diamandoupolis is president of Sonoma State University, California

The State of General Education and the Liberal Arts

What has happened to general education and liberal arts during the 1970s? I find the following four items, or four confusions, germane to the current status of general education.

Worth and Utility

First, there is general skepticism and confusion as to the worth and utility of general or liberal education—from different quarters, for different reasons, for different arguments. In institutions of higher learning there is, or there has been, such skepticism either because liberal arts education has been trivialized or because it is irrelevant to professional training; because it is exposed to political manipulation or because it is a tool of the establishment (remember the late 1960s or early 1970s); because it's too expensive or the payoffs don't relate to its alleged intrinsic worth. Despite an underlying embarrassment, there is, or there was, a general belief that somehow both the worth and the utility of liberal arts education can be contested, disputed, and doubted.

Nature and Uniqueness

The second thing that I believe characterizes the 1970s with regard to the liberal arts and general education (and proof of this is the commissioning of task force after task force to deal with it) is, or was, confusion surrounding both the nature and the uniqueness of the liberal arts education. Beyond the whole question of worth and utility, there was a pervasive realization, a pervasive embarrassment, that the nature and uniqueness of liberal arts education was in a state of confusion. Harvard's Rosovsky scheme is symptomatic. The alleged preoccupation of our students with professional training aggravated the problem. Whatever the reason, I don't think we are distorting the historical facts if, in looking at the 1970s, we say that American higher education, in colleges and universities devoted to the liberal arts, was experiencing serious doubts about the nature and uniqueness of general education and the liberal arts.

I deliberately put general education and liberal arts together: my argument rests on the claim that any serious general education is necessarily liberal and any liberal education necessarily rests on certain concepts of general education. Thereby the conflicts that often arise among distribution, major, preprofessional training, and professional training as well as between education as a cosmetic activity and education as preparation for life are bypassed.

In the catalog of universities and colleges, or the prototypical colleges, there are lofty statements about how liberal education and general education for the cultivated mind are the best modes of learning—and about how that college or university is there to give it to you, more or less. But as we inspect more carefully institution after institution, faculty committee after faculty committee, dean's strategy after dean's strategy, we see that the fact of the matter is that there have been many acrimonious discussions and debates, tempered by cynicism, often by boredom, and sometimes by creative vigor which show that there is serious doubt as to what pedagogic strategy will work to enable students to acquire a liberal arts and science education—and what the whole thing is about. This issue is on the nature and uniqueness of a liberal arts and general education, and it is distinguishable from the issue on the mean-

ing, worth, and practical utility of a liberal arts and general education. The kinds of questions asked to confront this issue are: Can students get general education through a special approach to a particular discipline? Are interdisciplinary approaches the major and only suitable way to impart liberal education? What is the role of ideology, moral and political, in shaping a certain kind of liberal education?

The radical students of the 1960s, the minorities, and the special interest student groups came into higher education institutions saying, "It's our birthright to be here; it's the taxpayers' money that makes it possible for you to give us what we need and deserve. A strategy of education designed to confirm our ethnic pride or ideological preferences or our own moral and private and political concerns will be the thing that will work." Then there were the reactionaries or conservatives who argued for going back to basic and who said there was nothing as good as a scholastic education. Incidentally, I think the Harvard scheme is a classic example of accommodation: I call it the neoscholastic approach to learning, a reaffirmation of the eternal values—with a little sensitivity to the present and modest dreaming—always presented with disavowals, for no one is sure that the scheme will work.

Venerable committees of prestigious and creative pedagogues are recruited to formulate strategies and curriculums, but no sooner than they unveil their creations than their colleagues are out to get them. This is an intriguing development, if you look at it from what Marx would call the dialectic of developing institutions.

The concept of a curriculum that is responsive to equal access (or the concept of equal access) and the concept of a curriculum that is nonfatuous, nontrivial, and does justice to the aspirations of an assortment of students were the problems of the 1970s and will be, I believe, the continuing problems of the 1980s. What institution can be cited as successful in solving the pedagogic problems of instructing the so-called disadvantaged—the socially disadvantaged, the culturally disadvantaged, the economically disadvantaged, or just simply the disadvantaged? (To my horror, I found that in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare something misdescribed as MGM—the mentally gifted mind—is classed with the disadvantaged.) What institution has developed curriculum that pays special attention to these needs while at the same time upholding its avowed philosophy to create or sustain its vision of the enlightened person? I would say none, despite the tremendous amount of money spent on educational opportunity programs. These students are victims of both economic paternalism and social insensitivity on the one hand and educational neglect and abandon on the other.

For example, Brandeis, a school I respect and to which I am permanently indebted, had a reputedly magnificent and unique program in transitional education which enabled students to go from the state of illiteracy to the state of competence and to benefit from a shamelessly and proudly elitist institution. But how much did these creations in pedagogy affect the overall philosophy of Brandeis—as one of the top private institutions in the country? The fact of the matter is that although now, 10 years later, the university, responding to social and economic forces, is producing the most successful class of prelaw, premedical, and prebusiness students, something of the visionary character of the institution was lost because it failed to take advantage of the opportunity to evolve a curriculum that would do justice to the liberal arts and sciences as the 1970s demanded and as the 1980s might have anticipated.

This characteristic of higher education, as reading the *Chronicle* shows, is not unique. There is no curriculum, no set or sets of requirements that can be shown as adequate to a stated aim. It is like having doctors who say, "Here's the diagnosis, here's the accepted therapy, these are the medications that might help, take them—and goodbye"; and having no followup, no second or third visit, no examination of pharmacological reports, no exploration of how particular patients react allergically or therapeutically to the medicines. Analogies from medicine can be instructive for educators, throughout the history of education.

Relations Between General Education and Liberal Arts

As a result it seems to me the third general area of failure and confusion is that general education and liberal arts education do not relate (though as I have already said, I believe they must be put together). As the curricula are set up across the country, as the general education and liberal arts philosophy are advertised, they don't seem to fit together. Hence the apologies and the ad hoc adjustments in institution after institution (which, in my judgment, don't always work), such as more extensive tutorial programs, more expensive advising, better seminars. But these are the kinds of solutions that don't speak to the bigger problem of how the philosophy and the strategy have been coordinated; and I'm arguing that we all know they are uncoordinated.

Nothing can be more embarrassing than reading our own catalogs. When I read mine recently I couldn't believe it. It is a document that any person with minimal skepticism and controlled cynicism will find utterly incomprehensible. The catalog is inaccurate viewed either as a document discussing what is going on or as an instruction as to what one ought to do to attain something. Classically, catalogs state requirements, departmental expectations, and the end result—in the preface. But we shouldn't have prefaces to avoid conclusions. Usually catalogs end with zoology and start with anthropology, but I want to know what the conclusion of the catalog is. However you juxtapose the departments or finesse the issue of interdepartmental divisions and other assortments, this problem remains endemic in the strategy of learning.

Benefits

The last confusion I want to describe is a fundamental confusion as to what the benefits of a liberal arts education really are. Enlightened people, even sympathetic alumni, gullible trustees, and respectable politicians and legislators, however nostalgic and sentimental they may be, recognize that somehow the benefits of their education, or the aims of different educational institutions as those institutions profess to pursue them, do not relate in a convincing way to the "real" world. Lots of people will tell you that you need a liberal arts education. Lots of people will tell you that it is beautiful to have. Lots of people will tell you that you cannot do without it. Lots of people will tell you that it is your birthright. And some people will tell you that in these times in which wistfulness for leadership provokes presidents to become silly and pathetic, and more reflective minds to lapse into despair, somehow we ought to know how our graduates will begin to cash in—possibly throughout life—on what they are getting or got from their education.

To sum it up, then, I find four confusions to plague the educational scene in the 1970s and I suggest they may be continued as we come into the 1980s: confusion on the worth and utility, the nature and uniqueness, the relations between, and the benefits of general education and liberal arts education.

Areas in Which To Seek Advice, Counsel, and Enlightenment

Where can we seek help? First, the negative side. We cannot get any clues from the social consensus: America is too big, too vast, too differentiated, too pluralistic, too confused, too much. No discerning mind can point to something and say, "This is America," without getting immediately involved in the most hopeless controversies about judgment, unstated ideology, or suspect aims. So, if we, as educators, go to the legislature to see what they want us to do, we won't get any answers. If we go to the high schools—the counselors and the superintendents—we are not going to get answers from them, either. Our colleagues in education will tell us their problems and criticize us (and especially if we deserve criticism, we should be tolerant of it), but they won't give us hints or suggestions.

As we look for answers outside of education, we don't find clues that will help us, even on the editorial pages of the newspapers. Suppose we look at the professions, for example, the lawyers. They usually don't say much about education proving the utility of liberal arts for the legal profession; but to the degree that they say anything, it tends to be cosmetic rather than integral to the value and utility of education—and questions about the value and utility of education must be constantly kept in mind if we are ever going to define them. Practicing scientists will say some things about the necessity of education: yes, if you want to be a doctor in biology, you have to major in biology; if you want to be a practicing astronomer, you have to major in astronomy. If you want to be an economist in industry, you have to study economics, sociology, and psychology. But how, why, to what end, and with what expectations are questions the professors have to answer—which throws the ball back in our territory.

If there is any area in which there is an agreement it is that (to put it a very old fashioned way) the transmissions of knowledge and the advancement of knowledge in any and every field requires special skills, special training, and direction. This transmission and advancement cannot be done in the marketplace (the city of Athens died long ago), nor in thinktanks, nor in a piecemeal way. Hence the value of education: your department of astronomy teaches astronomy; your department of economics teaches economics.

So we are confronted with a dilemma. If we go to the outside world to look for advice, we don't get much that's pertinent. If we stay with our own folks, we are only wallowing in our own self-pity. How can we resolve this dilemma?

I want to suggest—and here I begin to come to something bordering on the positive side—that this dilemma can be resolved if we recognize that we are both producers of marketable commodities and responders to what the market would like to buy. It's a very vague kind of idea, and the history of education may help, for in every era in which education thrived—at the outset of the fifth century in Renaissance Italy, in seventeenth century France, in eighteenth century England, in nineteenth century Germany—there has been some dyna-

mic connection, either between the whole society and the academic institution or between a certain segment of society and the academic institution. All of us working for publicly supported institutions, then, are stuck—or blessed—with the chance of having to deal with the whole society. That implies that we have to see if it is a matter of studying (not presuming) what the market wants to buy. That is, we ourselves must determine what high school students want, and not in terms of what high school counselors tell us they want. That is a very analytic, critical job. If we go out and determine, regionally—or if we want to be bold, nationally—what the market is looking for, when we come back to our own institutions we have a chance to use our imagination, make some critical discriminations, and meet needs in ways that are not a mere response but in ways that are creative about the product we can produce. Then we can go out and market our product with the imagination required. If we do this, I believe the dilemma between wading out into the world to find the message and trying to find it within ourselves can be broken.

And the way one breaks it—and here I want to quote *Ways of Wordmaking*, one of the latest works of Nelson Goodman, one of the subtlest and profoundest contemporary philosophers in this country—is to say that the whole enterprise of intellect, of the arts, of education, is to be fundamentally constructive with the aid of imagination and with the flexibility that keeps us moving, while at the same time to remember what we have learned about the enterprise of intellect as it ought to be fostered in colleges and universities.

Problems That Show the Utility and Value of General Education and Liberal Arts Education

Our institutions are categorically different from institutions of secondary education or elementary education or other modes of education, such as television, books, exciting conversation. We have some fascinating opportunities to move to the frontiers of knowledge. We can commit ourselves to the cultivation of the intellect and aim at rediscovering and reaffirming the worth and utility of education and at enabling our students to see the benefits that can be accorded to them. We can affirm that the only way to bypass the dilemma between academic scholasticism and public confusion is to affirm that there are certain things we are after.

What Education Should Contain

What are these things we are after? Here I want to use four themes from Peter Jay, Great Britain's ambassador to the United States. He gave a magnificent speech at Berkeley's graduate school several months ago. (I recommend that you ask him to send you a copy.)

The study of traditions—Acquainting students with intellectual, moral, and practical traditions of the past is one of Peter Jay's themes—and I deliberately use the word "theme," not "subject," "topic," or "discipline"—that is well worth entertaining. One of the dominant things in our institutions can be the study of traditions. We don't have to say we want Mexican-American professors to teach Mexican-American traditions: that's a very narrow, highly regionalistic approach. The same goes for black studies, oriental studies, peruvian studies. But we can say, "We're a small school, we don't have too

many resources, we want to do a good job, and we don't want to cheat anybody. Therefore we have to study from the vantage point of traditions."

The cultivation of sensibility—The second theme is what one might call the cultivation of sensibility (and there is nothing more powerful than using this weapon to recruit). I want to cultivate the sensibility of the young, the sensibility of the old, the sensibility of distorted and depraved natures like those Dostoevsky describes, the sensibility of the loving members of some elite group committed to philosophy—and the sensibility of our times, as gleaned from literature, as reflected in art, as practiced by benevolent governors and bizarre and grotesque politicians, and as advertised by the chamber of commerce of Santa Rosa. Everyone is committed to the welfare and well-being of humans, and as Aristotle says, every person naturally desires happiness. The question is not that every person desires it, but how we can reach an agreement on what happiness is and how we can attain it.

Examination of our dependence on science and technology—What do we know about science and technology? How does it bear on the Three Mile Island disaster? Skylab coming down from the sky? It is astronomy? Economics? Social policy? Anyone with minimal intuitive power senses our dependence on science and technology: you don't have to go to school to know that you depend on your car. The third theme, then, beyond sensibility and traditions, is science and technology—as an all pervasive disaster or blessing. The bearing of science and technology on our lives can be approached historically: you can go all the way back to the Utopians, cite Rousseau, mention Marx.

Recognition of new vistas—The last theme is to find and recognize new vistas on the horizon—even though it is redundant to talk about vistas on the horizon. What kinds of vistas? New ways in which people can get along with each other, new ways of giving meaning to your job, new ways of facing the horror of leisure or anticipating the beauty of retirement. Anything is part of the new vista depending on your imagination.

The Vital Problems

These themes of traditions, sensibility, science and technology, and new vistas can help us cultivate our students' intellects as well as rediscover and reaffirm the worth and utility of general education and liberal arts education. Now we need to transpose these themes onto problems that will enable our students to see the benefits such an education can accord them.

For that I go back to Peter Jay, who mentioned as part of his inventory of things that ought to concern us four issues that he believes (and, as a pessimistic conservative, I agree with him) will be the problems of the decades ahead. In a sense these problems are hackneyed, but they are vital problems all the same: overpopulation, economics, technology, and politics. The rate at which the world is reproducing itself will make things problematic by the year 2000. This aggravates the worldwide disparity between expectations and acquisitions and seems to ensure that the decades ahead will be ones of contested politics, third world against second world against first world. Peter Jay's question to Berkeley was, "What are universities doing for these problems?" Who is evolving methods and preparing to deal with these problems responsibly and significantly?

Strategies

As we confront the challenge of general education and liberal arts education, I want to combine the thematic approach and a proudly intellectual, creative style by insisting on four strategies. How well these strategies work depends on the institution and the quality of the faculty, but any or all could work—if we are committed to them. We can, as presidents, persuade our faculties to rework their curriculums, to review their offerings, and to make judgments about their own development by using the following four strategies or lines of thought:

- *The problematic approach*—Tasks need to be perceived and responsibilities dealt with as if they were problematic, and problems need to be presented to students in intellectually engaging, imaginative ways. The problematic approach is indispensible to any liberal arts and sciences education, especially one that will do justice to general education, given all the problems and the absence of illumination from anywhere else. Our illumination must be within ourselves.

- *Studying issues of common concerns*—We have to break the deadlock, the contest, between departmental and interdepartmental, disciplinary and interdisciplinary, regional and special interest kinds of problems and say that there is a way of talking about and studying topically issues of common concern. (This can also be economical in times of diminishing resources because you can use faculty from different departments.) These can be what Peter Jay mentioned as exciting topics, for example, planning in environmental studies, toxicology in pharmacology, diet and carcinogens in nursing, economics and psychology in health care.

- *The dialectic style*—As the thematic approach moves us from problems to topics, we come to this third strategy (close to my heart and very old fashioned) which might be called the dialectic style so that we can stay in the forefront as argumentative individuals. In the years or decades ahead, we cannot be effective presidents without being in the midst of trouble with the faculty, constantly keeping them off balance in all matters relating to education and pedagogy. As chief strategists, chief tacticians in our own institutions, we must constantly question, constantly look for, reexamine, and reexplore resolutions—which is the best way to remove faculty from their inborn apathy and to protect faculty from the atrophy that comes with diminishing salaries and layoff insecurities.

- *Practicality*—We have to emphasize in all places, with all special groups, that we are the vanguard of practicality. We are not wasting the money of the taxpayers. We are dealing with the problems of our times seriously, with the courage and intellectual discipline to outline strategies to make our dealings effective.

In Conclusion

By producing human beings that can contribute to the development of the future, we are institutions that are, in the deepest sense of the word, futuristic. We have been upholding Whitehead's famous remark that a university is the creator of the future. In this sense, politically we are not as exposed and dependent as we appear in legislatures and public opinion.

Another way of putting it is to say that the first academy was established by mere relocation from the city of Athens to the groves of academe outside Athens. If the first academy was simply separated from the city in order to be reintegrated, I believe that in the democracy of our times, in this country, we can do the same; and in that way we will be discharging a historical role beyond our wildest dreams.

In short, I am optimistic, though our jobs are incessant and unceasing and require energy and tenacity. We cannot afford to waver, and we can succeed, I believe, with the help of AASCU and through solidarity among ourselves.

THE CONDITION OF ADVANCEMENT IN STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

James L. Fisher

In the years ahead virtually all colleges and universities, both public and private, will need to increase their advancement activities because of the kinds of problems that confront us collectively and individually.

To use the words of one of my colleagues, in the decade ahead we are going to have to learn how to "shrink creatively." Some public schools may be absorbed by larger state universities; others may be merged with other state colleges or become branches in state systems; and some may be eliminated completely. I don't think there is any question that these things will happen—and in many instances they already are happening. Therefore I believe that the key to success for us during this next decade will be a combination of sound academic programs and presidential awareness and sophistication in the area of institutional advancement.

Optimism and Realism

In a handbook of institutional advancement, Howard Jones wrote that no one involved in advancement or development activities could afford to wear rose-colored glasses, for institutional advancement activities require both optimism and realism. I feel it is important to underscore realism. Without optimism, few advancement efforts would be made—but without realism, few, if any, would succeed.

Let's look first at reality, bearing in mind, of course, our fundamental optimism.

According to recent polls there is not a single American social institution—including education—that has the confidence of a majority of the American people. Whereas in 1966, five out of 12 major American social institutions enjoyed the confidence of Americans, today not a single one does.

How serious is the situation for the institution we serve, American higher education? Clark Kerr recently said that higher education is in a condition of crisis unlike any other period in the entire history of the United States. This statement was echoed and buttressed by President David Saxon of the University of California and Chancellor Albert Bowker at the Berkeley campus. Saxon called it a "trench war" in which there are no "grabbers," no aviators wearing fancy uniforms, no knights on black and white horses on opposing hills. There are few ways in which we can truly get the serious attention of the greater American public. As for how we're doing collectively, according to former Commissioner of Education Ernest Boyer, "The least effective and coherent influence in Washington, D.C., is higher education." I found essentially the same opinion as I talked to elected persons in both houses of Congress, federal officers, and persons in the associations.

Many Americans today believe there is waste in higher education, both public and private. There is concern about tenure, which is seen as a haven for

James L. Fisher is president of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education

the incompetent and for professors who want to "do it" our American way of life. American companies have already funded 50 chairs in free enterprise to counteract this perceived condition. Collective bargaining is viewed as a force that will drive costs up and quality down. Campus involvement in affirmative action programs is seen as unrealistic, unfair, or insincere. Employers, parents, and students are increasingly skeptical as they hear inflated claims about the value of a college education—and as they find that many college graduates are not educated or can't find jobs or both.

In the late 1940s when I considered a career in higher education, it looked good. Institutions were intact and support for higher education was there virtually for the asking. I entered higher education as a faculty member at Illinois State University. During the early 1960s I entered administration there and became involved in AASCU activities under Walter Hager. I was certain at that time of even greater contributions and appreciation for my role, inspired by so many, particularly by Robert Bowen, my president.

Then chaos struck without warning in the mid-sixties. Our American institutions—government, religion, military, education, even the family—seemed to disintegrate. It became physically dangerous for certain ideas to appear on college campuses. I became a college president during the late 1960s, and during what seemed like my first presidential hours, my office was occupied by angry, unhearing students who held me personally responsible for the war in Southeast Asia, the domestic racial situation, and pollution of the environment. I felt that my early training in the marine corps was more valuable to my presidency than anything I had learned in higher education.

"Democracy" poured onto the college campus in the quise of equal opportunity, equal access, and affirmative action—appropriate, necessary, and even ringingly beautiful ideas that should be characteristic of our way of life. The traditions and structures of our colleges and universities were broken, and forces for reform pressed even harder for democracy and what we called human rights. Changes were instituted on virtually every campus in America: laws were passed, policies revised, funds were granted. To speak against open admission in a national meeting was dangerous to one's professional reputation and brought accusations of being "undemocratic." The curriculum was compromised to the point where it became possible to graduate from many of our accredited colleges without being educated or having passed significant tests of literacy and academic achievement. Although we accredited these institutions, we couldn't speak about it because to do so was not considered fair or democartic or consistent with the national movement. After all, undergraduate standardized tests were not culturally fair, so it was of little consequence that every year from the early 1960s standardized test scores went down and colleges grades went up.

During this same period, faculty and students assumed more power in institutional government, confronting anxious presidents with their demands for full involvement. Paradoxically, that classic dichotomizing agent, collective bargaining, became the popular vehicle to improve faculty conditions. Student loans were granted across the board. Many students wouldn't repay them, and many institutions refused to manage them properly. Presidents found it increasingly difficult to make decisions as faculty and students demanded involvement, governing boards demanded results, and state systems pressed presidents into the mold of plant manager. Persons like Kenneth Boulding,

Clark Kerr, and David Riesman concluded there was a leadership crisis in higher education.

The democratization of search committees, the prospect of endless bureaucratic struggles, and the requirements of broad sunshine laws often served to make able candidates unwilling to offer themselves for presidencies. Many institutions have wound up with conciliatory, faceless presidents, incapable either of vision or of the imaginative kind of planning required for what Boulding has called the "management of decline."

Of course, it only follows that out of this chaos the government is trying to bring order to the campuses: and this has come to comprise the greatest single danger in the history of American higher education. Government control and free inquiry are antithetical notions.

As if these conditions weren't enough to amount to a crisis, the economic tides in the country also have contributed significantly to the dilemma of higher education. Inflation at an annual rate of from 7 to 13 percent, coupled with public skepticism about the basic worth of a college education, has meant less real money for the operation of our institutions and an understandable inclination to compromise the liberal arts for the marketplace. The temptation of the market is further dramatized by the shrinking student population. Everyone is looking for new markets; yet we all know there will not be enough students to go around in the 1980s. Total enrollment has dropped for the first time this year, and this decline is only a mild portent of the future.

And so here we are today. Is there hope? I think there is.

As a psychologist I know that full and honest examination is necessary for catharsis. Before one can solve the problem, one must recognize its full dimension. We seem finally to be beginning to start that process today, finally beginning to tell the truth about what we've been.

This year at forums, several national meetings, and through the recent Carnegie report, candid public admission of the difficult problems in higher education has been made. We have spoken about what we have done to ourselves and what our difficulty is. Several of our presidents have admonished us to clean house and fight. State organizations are beginning to assemble; regional organizations of state college and university presidents are beginning to come together to talk about problems and to try and put together alliances. Other presidents are speaking frankly and even becoming controversial—and being supported where it counts in terms of the influence and powers of hierarchy affecting their institutions. It is now abundantly clear that we will neither regain public support nor fend off the approach of government control unless we set about the business of self-renewal and self-regulation.

I recently asked a president who was about to retire at the age of 71 what he thought of the condition of American higher education. He sat back and smiled and said, "Lousy." And it's our fault.

But now recommendations and plans are emerging from this kind of honesty that I think will amount to a renaissance for American higher education, particularly for public institutions. Voices of reform urge institutions to examine and even do away with wildly innovative and nontraditional degree programs. They urge colleges to restore standards, particularly in admissions, as well as meaningful grades and strong programs in the liberal arts. They advise colleges to state their goals explicitly and in ways that are measurable and to

deny false or exaggerated claims. Across the country, colleges and universities are commencing to act. Some institutions already have gone back to a core curriculum.

I think there is reason to believe that the future can be bright for certain kinds of institutions.

The Importance of Advancement Programs

This bright future assumes, however, that we have evaluated honestly our academic condition; that we have admitted our difficulties to ourselves and in public; and that, if necessary, we will set in motion a design for institutional renewal. Then and only then will we be able to implement a successful institutional advancement or development program. Then and only then will we be able to inspire support from persons or sources that are able to enhance our colleges and universities.

We are reminded by tested and accomplished persons that the crisis is real, particularly in the field of institutional advancement, and that the future will not be bright for all public institutions. Those institutions that do not prosper will be those that have not placed sufficient emphasis on their educational programs and on their management designs. They will not have realistically involved faculty, students, and trustees in accomplishing the goals of their institutions. They will not always have maintained the fundamental and final authority of the presidents in all matters at their institutions. They will have depended on sporadic efforts in governmental relations, in fundraising, alumni relations, and public affairs rather than on a continuous development or advancement program emphasizing educational ideas rather than institutional needs. They will be led by presidents who are neither bold nor enlightened, who spend more time lamenting than progressing.

Those institutions that prosper in the 1980s will be those that have worthy academic programs based solidly in the liberal arts, only topped by the reality of the marketplace, and those that have presidents who are sufficiently sophisticated in institutional advancement techniques to measure up to the intense competition.

Unfortunately, as yet many public college and university presidents simply don't know enough about institutional advancement. Some have been successful, but most have not given serious consideration to development or advancement programs. Many public institutions have never held a capital campaign. Many do not have sophisticated annual fund operations; and almost none have deferred giving officers. Some institutions still have part-time alumni officers and no one at all in governmental relations. Too many presidents tend to view development activities too narrowly, and such an attitude can permanently cripple an advancement program.

From the beginnings of organized major development efforts in the early 1920s, we have been advised that development should not be a mere circumlocution for fundraising. It is important to emphasize that terms like "institutional advancement and development," "public affairs," "alumni relations," and "governmental relations" are not simply euphemisms for fundraising. Indeed, any institution that views these as such surely will have a less than successful program. Institutions with such views will, when they get into a crisis period, reduce or eliminate their staff in advancement and development—

and, at least with private institutions, soon after the institution itself will go under. Public institutions usually survive, or they are merged or taken over.

I am not suggesting that a good advancement program can save a compromised academic program—at least not for long. But I am saying that a good advancement program can save a good institution that is in trouble.

Many administrators often lack the background to appreciate this vital area of advancement. I think this is especially true for many of us in the public area, for most of us come from academic backgrounds where terms like "public relations," "development," and "fundraising" are associated with local community fund drives. Development is often considered by faculty as everything from academic planning to physical plant maintenance and a program in professional growth. The resulting attitude is usually a combination of skepticism, cynicism, discomfiture, and ignorance. To put it quite simply, this attitude has to change. More education, information, and involvement are needed, the result of which will most assuredly be more appreciation.

Development or institutional advancement should be a well-managed line division of the institution that includes the very best professional talent and involves faculty, administrators, students, staff, alumni, and trustees. Every segment of the institutional family should be used in relating to every external public, to every present and potential source of support. The development or advancement division of a college or university should normally include fundraising, public affairs, publications, alumni relations, governmental relations, and often admissions—which is a new concept to most public institutions. Also included can be intercollegiate athletics and special events programs.

Admissions and Student Recruitment

Increasingly, as colleges and universities realize the totality and importance of institutional advancement, they are recognizing the value of assigning admissions to the development area. Terms like "position," "share of the market," and "marketing mix" are becoming commonplace on campuses. National organizations are holding conferences on effective student recruitment.

Every admissions effort, from the first handshake to the first mail contact to the first orientation program for new students, is a development function and an advancement function. All should reflect the distinctiveness of the institution.

Institutional Advancement Division Structure

The institutional advancement division, along with the academic, business, and student affairs divisions, should report at the vice-presidential level directly to the president. A strong case can be made for locating the office of the development vice president near the office of the president. These top four officers—of the academic, business, development, and student affairs divisions—should comprise a cabinet that together with the president reviews, receives, refines, and develops strategies for every institutional effort.

Today the development vice president is an absolutely vital member of that team. Development or advancement officers are educators, or they should be, and they must perceive themselves as educators—and be perceived as educators.

Those institutions that really succeed in the 1980s will be those best able to present significant and exciting educational programs to prospective students as well as to prospective givers, whether they be in the state legislature or in the money community. Many institutions today place their primary emphasis on a capital fund drive—on how much the college needs—rather than on selling an idea or concept about the fundamental importance of public institutions in the future of America. However, it is clear that most donors give to support ideas: they want to hear and become part of an exciting plan, a plan that includes obvious and significant goals that are followed by, not preceded by, dollar signs.

Presidential Style

During periods of emergency or crisis, another fundamentally important step in development can be neglected: broadening the basis of support for your institution, making friends, cultivating your influence hierarchy, developing a more impressive influence base. You may think that you don't have the time, that there are simply too many other more pressing problems. But to ignore broadening the base of support for your institution is to be guilty of short-run thinking and to invite long-run disaster. There is nothing as important to the generation of resources for your institution as a strong base of support—and regardless of where you are in terms of having a strong base, it can always be broadened and deepened. If you take it for granted, it can evaporate overnight.

Building a base of support is largely dependent on presidential style. Most of us have learned style out of the composite we have put together from presidents we have seen, but there appear to be certain universals that are important in all successful support building efforts.

The first universal is that the influence or power hierarchy affecting your institution should be identified as completely and systematically as possible. Files should be maintained on every individual or group who does or can help your college or university. In effect, you should draw up, or have drawn up, an order of battle on all persons who can or do influence the condition of your institution. You should attempt to know as much about them as you can so you can help make them more effective—and anything you collect ought to be public, at least on demand.

The second universal is that you should set about the business of systematic and assiduous cultivation of those individuals and, more appropriately, the organizations they represent. I think a president should literally spend himself or herself in the process. To the extent possible, meetings should be one on one. I've found that you cannot get important people to come to lunch or go to dinner, but you can get almost anyone at breakfast. Presidents and development officers should accept and seek every opportunity to speak before important groups and attend important functions. Community organizations are also invaluable.

The key is not to involve yourself in activities that are overly time-consuming or of low priority. For a college president or vice president, it is better to be involved a little in many activities than a lot in only a few—and that is contrary to what an intellectual wants to do. The significant thing is to be involved. Remember your prime commitment is to your institution.

A public college or university president also should think in terms of cultivating the greater public, and many of us don't do that at all. We think we can do it by ingratiating ourselves or establishing one-on-one relationships with members of the influence or power community. That is important, but for building a base of public support, presidential visibility may be more important. Use your office as a forum for your institution. Speak to many groups, the larger the better. Appear on radio and television. Try to get your own radio or TV show. If you write quickly, do a regular newspaper column.

These kinds of activities conducted astutely can do more than any other public relations effort to enhance the influence of the president and the influence of the institution where it counts. Whatever proposals you advance to whatever segment of the power community will be more acceptable, including proposals to your board and your general assembly, as will your appeals for private support. Even your deferred giving efforts will be more successful if you and your institution are perceived as worthy, vigorous, and influential. I mention deferred giving again because too many public colleges and universities don't even have an office on deferred giving.

The Presidency Itself

Finally, I'd like to say a few words about the presidency itself. The central person exercising political and moral leadership for an institution, be it college or university or country, must be its president. The idea of the college president as plant manager seems to be setting in in many states, and that is an idea that must be countered: indeed, it must be fought boldly.

The most important ingredient in presidential leadership is the ability to foster trust, inspire confidence, and generate support. It's obvious that a president can best accomplish this through his or her personal activities. His or her rhetoric must shine through in behaviour as well as in attitudes. As college presidents today, it seems to me that you have to provide a sense of direction and style for the college community, and you must spend yourself in this pursuit. This has to be done in a manner consistently revealing your respect for individuals and their right to participate in the shaping of the institution—while at the same time maintaining your final and absolute authority in all matters.

In this I see no contradiction, for I am convinced than an effective president can provide direction and maintain final authority while, at the same time, accommodating universal involvement. Indeed, I believe that this is the only way we will be able to renew ourselves and regain the abiding support and confidence of our people.

I also think that, as presidents, we must surround ourselves with persons who are better than ourselves. To be secure and comfortable only in the company of lessers is a guarantee for failure, particularly during difficult times. Your associates must be both able and good. They must be so wise and loyal that in times of difficulty you will go to them not out of courtesy but because you value and respect their judgment.

To my mind, as an effective college president you must understand, appreciate, and endeavor to exhibit all of these presidential characteristics. Of course at times you will fall short of your ideals, and you will fail. As is often the case when one is so deeply committed, your mission may occasionally

temporarily obviate other considerations; and you may become short, testy, and sometimes mean. But within you should be a combination of dedication and goodness coupled with an almost prophetic ability to anticipate the future—a combination that makes for excitement, fulfillment, and contribution.

Make no mistake. I am confident that it will be the college and university presidents who will be the prime determinant in the future of American higher education.

Following James Fisher's presentation, Presidents Robert Bersi and David Sweet commented on the concept of institutional advancement from their perspectives. Sweet is president of Rhode Island College and Bersi is president of Western Connecticut State College.

David Sweet

There are a half dozen questions that we have to face if we are going to succeed with Jim Fisher's charge to us to be effective presidents in the 1980s; and this is a pivotable academic year coming up in which to face them.

For most of the country, the single most important fact is demographics. 1979 is the peak year for high school graduates. It culminates 30 years of uninterrupted growth in the number of graduating high school seniors. As far as colleges and universities were concerned, there were not only more high school graduates, but more of everything—more students, more faculty, more buildings more money. Not enough, but more. In nine years at Illinois State University, I saw enrollment grow from 3500 students to more than 15,000—dramatic evidence of what has been going on for 30 years. Now we and our vice presidents, who grew up administratively and academically during that 30-year period, begin a new era in which the word is "less."

It starts with that key demographic factor and just snowballs, because explicity or implicity, everything is tied to the figures which drive enrollment. Some of us, as in the state of Rhode Island, do not have state authorities who actually have compiled formulae, but those are the figures they are watching. For that reason, we must start paying attention to half a dozen questions that I have borrowed loosely from Peter Drucker.

First, we must ask the question, "What business are we in?" What is our business right now and what should it be in the new decade? I asked that of my institution, and I discovered at least 12 businesses we are in. Our central business is education, including teaching, learning, research, and public service. But, whether we want to be or not, we also are in the entertainment/recreation business, the health service/health maintenance business, the bookstore/sundry business, the food business, and the housing business. We don't even know for sure why we are in any of those businesses.

The next question we must ask is, "Who are our customers now and who should our customers be in the next decade or two?" While the obvious answer is that students are our customers, that does not tell us very much.

What we really need to know is the answer to the third question, "What do our customers want and need from us?" Or, "Why do students come to us?" I suspect that if we answer that question, we will find that students do not come to us for the reasons that most intellectual faculty want to believe

they come to us. Students come to us because they are developing human beings; because their parents think it would be good to have a college education; and because the employment market couldn't absorb them and they had to fill that time, perferably in a socially acceptable manner. Many students really do not know why they are in college. You cannot expect that their felt needs and wants to coincide with your informed judgement about their needs and wants.

If our institutions are going to survive in the era of "creative shrinking," we must know what it is that will bring in the kinds of students that we want. That means that we must recognize that our customers are not simply students. They are the employers of students, the general assembly, the governor, and public opinion leaders, all of whom have needs and wants which they expect our institutions to satisfy. I believe that one of the reasons that the American people have lost confidence in higher education is that we thought our only customers were late adolescents and young adults. Catering exclusively to the needs and wants of that group is a guaranteed way to lose the confidence of the adults who are the most effective opinion leaders in our society. If we are going to win back the confidence of the opinion leaders, we must do what Jim spoke about—rebuild confidence in our academic standards. That means we must have the moral courage to take on some of our customers as we get them. But, we had better know who they are and why they come. We must know more about our customers than we do now, which brings us back to the first question, "What is our business?"

We must begin to give some priority listing to the various businesses that we are in. If we are in the entertainment/recreation business through performing arts series, theatre programs, concert programs, and athletic programs, we must ask ourselves why we are in that business. Are we in it to attract people to the campus, to help us enroll more students? Are we in it to make money because we need resources to carry on our central academic programs? Are we in it to build confidence with the general public? If we know whose needs and wants we are satisfying, we can sort out why we are in some of these "supportive businesses." It's not enough to know what the wants and needs are. We also must know what the services and activities are we engage in that directly relate to meeting those wants and needs. After determining which services and activities we are involved in, we then can determine which resources we need to supply the needs and wants of the customers we have identified. Finally, we need to ask ourselves, "What are the obstacles and resistances, both internal and external, which we must overcome in order to secure the resources?" Once we have answered the questions, we will be in a better position to determine what the function, purpose, and mission of the development function should be.

To me, the development function comes down to one thing: resource acquisition. The key criterion for development work—whether it is alumni relations, publications, governmental relations, or media relations—is what does it contribute to the acquisition of the resources that we need in order to operate. As far as I am concerned, Rhode Island College does not operate an alumni program as an end in itself, nor are we Harper and Row; we are Rhode Island College. If we can get the resources we need without putting out a single publication, without providing a single alumni with a single service, that is fine, but I do not think it can be done. If you want the resources you

need in order to carry out the basic academic enterprise, you must do an effective job of alumni relations, publications, and media relations, but you cannot do those jobs as ends in themselves.

Jim's program of breakfast with legislative leaders was effective because Jim knew what he wanted out of those breakfasts. You must know what you want, and what you want are resources. That is not a selfish, materialistic activity for a president.

Finally, I would like to reinforce Jim's point that AASCU presidents must be effective political leaders, they must be effective participants in the political process. They can fulfill that role only if they are effective educators. If we are not prepared to provide educational leadership and define what it means to be well-educated in the last two decades of the century, then we cannot expect to be heeded as political leaders. Being both an educational and a political leader can be troublesome: there are values, attitudes, and behaviors that are legitimate to the world of public politics, but which lose their legitimacy when they are merged and meshed with the world of education. The fundamental commitment of the educational enterprise is a commitment to truth. In a recent essay, Terry Sanford, president of Duke University, says that we must be committed to truth in our rhetoric and in our behavior, or we ought to fail. We will do much less damage if we fail than if we survive uncommitted to truth. My concern about the merger between politics and education is that the political world of today is a long way from Plato's Republic. It is not the world of philosopher kings. Plato understood that. Most American politicians understand that. I am concerned that in the effort to make our institutions politically potent, we may be tempted to adopt commitments that divert us from the searing commitment to truth. I do not denigrate the values of the political system. Even though we are not Plato's Republic, we are served well by our political system; but it is a political system to which, in this era, people look to solve all manner of problems. The values of the political system can permeate even those enterprises that heretofore have stood with some success independently of that system, such as the church and the university.

When we recognize that a prime function of a university president is to be a politically effective leader, we are less able to stand outside the political system—we are too much a part of it. Somehow, we have to walk that very narrow line which avoids the politicialization of the university.

Robert Bersi

I would like to take a holistic political approach to a president's role in the advancement of the institution through the mine fields of state government and state agencies. My comments will be akin to a "letter from the trenches," an epistle from my institution in the state of Connecticut on how we are attempting to get things done, while at the same time trying to keep things from being done to us.

In any state institution you cannot "go it alone." Coalitions and alliances are absolutely fundamental to what we have to do. The operational model that I have developed to align coalitions can best be described as a series of buffers or zones. When I took office four years ago, I realized that we were one of 27 public campuses in a state with a gross operating budget that

some states spend for three institutions. It was obvious that there would be quite a bit of activity for resources, and this activity would be political. I thus attempted to surround the institution with three concentric zones: a hard core of supporters, a zone of friends and allies, and an outer zone of informed neutrals. This is a dynamic model which permits people to move from one zone to another.

The core zone is drawn from the legislative or the political area, the economic community, which includes business, industry and organized labor, and a public opinion area, primarily the media. People in the core zone are totally committed, well-connected, mutually supportive, and they are always active. They do not need the president to be there to be active. What they require is to be thoroughly informed through a high level of personal, verbal contact. For example, during a particular major campaign for about $14 to $15 million in capital construction, my telephone contact with these people averaged 12 to 14 hours a week. With these individuals, the president serves as a coordinator and a "keeper of the educational flame." They don't require a leader; they are leaders.

The second zone, friends and allies, who are they? They are people who have a certain identification with the institution, and they have some vested interests. Their requirements are routine contact through mail, media, and meetings. The president's role here is to maintain a feeling of involvement and identification, and to be perceived as a leader. They can provide a background show of force to justify the activities of the hard core supporters, for example through letters, telegrams, testimony, and personal contacts.

The third zone, the informed neutrals, are drawn from everywhere. Their characteristics are similar to those in the core and friends and allies zones, except that informed neutrals have no practical reason for being affiliated with the institution by geographics, professional background, personal interest, or alumni relationship. They are in a position to affect what happens when you are not there to speak up. The best course seems to be to neutralize them with decent information. The procedure we use is to create, through a single or short series of contacts, a new and proper impression of the institution to correct the probably old and outdated impression they may have; then do a carefully selected followup. I tend to keep these people "at arm's length" once we have created the single favorable impression. What we expect of them is nothing more than a lack of opposition as the core zone promotes institutional objectives, or a kind of understanding that will prevent them from being recruited as opposition. Most of the decisions made about Western Connecticut are made without my being present, as, for example, in conversations in the governor's office. The people who take part in those discussions should be informed and neutral.

Who are the people drawn into the zones and how are they drawn in? One extremely good way to attract people into zones is by organizing projects whose functions match the interests of the group.

The College has a council of chief executive officers who represent a cross-section of the state's manufacturing and corporate headquarters. The council funds on a continuing basis the College's capacity to do applied regional research in demographics, salary surveys, fringe benefits surveys, and work force projections. In the process of working with us, they become committed to the College.

Organized labor is another important group. Any institution has the capacity to deliver coursework on contract administration, wage and compensation administration—the kinds of things that regional labor leaders need. Of course, something such as a campaign for capital construction funds, which has the potential to bring work into the region, can be used to generate support among labor groups.

Media represents another group from which to draw members of the three zones. Although you occasionally can get some coverage in national and statewide media, this is basically background; your real influence resides with the local media. It is absolutely critical to build complete trust with the local media. The level of communication between my office and the two key radio stations, the local television station, and the key newspaper is as intense as it could be given time, strength, and patience.

Another large grouping from which you can draw is the residential city, which is either a headache or a love affair, depending on your town/gown relationship. There are key people who are very important, such as the mayor and the city planner. In testimony before a state committee, the city planner is extremely important in terms of what our growth means for intercity development, transportation, traffic control, and a variety of other things. Regional municipalities and governments are important; groups such as a congress of mayors (if you have such a body) or a task force for regional planning (if there isn't one, you should consider creating one). Departments of public administration on the campus can relate very well to these groups.

Then, of course, there are the special interest groups: the handicapped, students, alumni association, the Chamber of Commerce. I have found that the Chamber of Commerce is eager to have the president of the local institution on its board; and it is a good opportunity to let the Chamber know what your institution can do in terms of the regional research it needs and to develop a solid relationship.

Another group consists of those in state government. State legislators from the hometown delegation should be, of course, part of the core zone. State agencies such as the departments of public works, personnel, and commerce, contain some extremely conscientious people who should be identified and assisted. For example, the head of the state public works really makes an effort in his job, and it was music to his ears to have an editorial written about him in the student newspaper.

The staff of the governor's office is a special sub-group within state government. There is a cluster of individuals—cabinet members, secretaries, aides, assistants, and favored press—that forms the information inventory upon which the governor relies. Often decisions are made very quickly and there is not time to talk to an educator. The people trusted by the governor should know the institution and its mission.

A final group I consider important consists of former office holders, people who often are neglected when they are out of power. However, these people still have influence and time spent with them can be fruitful.

In this overview I have not touched specifically on fundraising, but I believe that the alliance-forming activities I have described impact directly upon the institution's capacity for both public and private support. In conclusion, whether it is capital construction, program development, political clout, or the acquisition of dollars, a state institution must be tied closely to informed neutrals, friends and allies, and a core of committed supports. In short, a state institution simply cannot go it alone.

A Systematic Approach to Self/Unit/Organization Time Management

Lee H. Smith

Editor's Note: The following paper was adapted from a three-hour presentation made during the Castine meeting with the benefit of more than 100 visual aids. The material represents a condensation of information typically presented in a two-day seminar. With these constraints, readers should be aware that the paper is a summary, albeit an informative one, of self/unit/organization time management philosophy and practice at Southwest Texas State University.

Once you are the president of a college or university—and, I should insert, all the presidents I know are "good", or they never would have gotten to be presidents—it is not so much a question of quality of work, but of quantity of work: how much can we accomplish in the short time we have in which to do it? The "Peter principle", which says essentially that all individuals in all organizations will ultimately rise to one level above their respective levels of competence, doesn't apply unless we very carefully define "competence". Rather, I think most of us ultimately rise to one level above our level of inundation—which again is a matter of quantity, not quality.

A systematic approach to self, unit and organization time management is crucial. I would encourage individuals with time problems—and I assume that includes all of us—to develop some sort of time management philosophy. Once a time management philosophy is developed by an individual, a unit or an organization, there are two systems which can be of significant help in enhancing the realization of that philosophy in a practical setting.

Before I talk about time management philosophy and the two systems which can provide a systematic approach within an organizational framework, I want to point out that there are two major enemies to the management of work in most organizations. One is "shortness of corporate memory." Because of fairly rapid turnover and, in some instances, a lack of understanding, jobs are repeatedly performed in an inconsistent fashion. The other major enemy is "ambiguity of expectation." Frequently individuals don't know what is expected of them. Combined, these two facts make it very difficult to manage and move organizations. In view of these two organization enemies, I contend that it is impossible to be a great organization manager until you are a great unit manager, which is impossible unless you are a great self-manager.

Classical Time Management

Now for classical time management. A reference that may be useful to you is, *The Time Trap,* by R. Alec Mackenzie (New York: AMACOM, 1972). It is one of the best classical time management books, although many good ones are available.

In discussing classical time management, I want to begin by talking about time as a most critical resource and continue with self-management, planning,

Lee H. Smith, is president of Southwest Texas State University

getting organized (e.g., screening interruptions and managing meetings), delegation, working with subordinates' time, and working with the secretary and staff. When we have finished these eight topics, we will have finished with classical time management. After that, I want to talk about attacking time-wasters systematically. I will refer mostly to two subsets of the 4BMAP System: job procedures (not to be confused with job descriptions) and operating letters.

Time as a Most Critical Resource

The question that is often asked is, "Do you have enough time?" The answer is usually an emphatic, "No." We often don't get to many of the important things because we are inundated by many things that aren't important, but which we feel we have to handle. Extensive surveys involving persons at all levels in organizations emphasize that very few have enough time. Most individuals say that they could use from 10 to 50 percent more time in order to perform their jobs adequately.

We need to look at time as a unique resource. It is a resource that can't be accumulated like money, and it is irretrievable. It is one of the most inexorable and inelastic elements. Many share the conviction that time, not money, is an institution's most critical resource.

One of the things that we need to do if we are going to be good time managers—in any setting—is to note time-wasters and their causes. Most individuals feel that their time problems are unique to them and their organizations, but there is a great similarity among time problems at all levels and in all organizations. If I asked you to list your time-wasters, I'm sure they would include meetings, the telephone, incoming mail, and five or six other kinds of time-wasters, because these emerge in any organization, whether a health-related organization, a university, or whatever.

One of the key problems that is often overlooked, though, has to do with internally generated time-wasters. When asked to identify their major time-wasters, individuals almost always will list externally generated time-wasters first—such as paperwork, delays, and the telephone. But it is important to note that many time-wasters are internally generated—like procrastination, lack of plan, lack of priorities, and crisis management. Some groups say their biggest time-wasters are their bosses; other groups say their biggest time-wasters are their subordinates. Very seldom is it "me", but that's where we need to begin if we are really going to talk about successful time management.

My administrative assistant and I, over a period of time, have made a list of all (as Ed McMahon would say to Johnny Carson) the time-wasters in the world. We have reduced them to a page and two-thirds. There are all kinds of problems: inconsistent action, outside activity, too much communication, unintelligible communication, to name a few. If you look at this list of time-wasters, you will find some very interesting things. First, some of them are externally-generated, and some of them are internally-generated. Second, you will see that many of them are pervasive, so that when you start to talk about solving the related time problems, it begins to be an almost impossible thing to be very specific and direct. Therefore, we have to talk about generic solutions before we talk about specific solutions.

What most classical time managers don't talk about consistently is the transferability of solution sets from one set of time-wasters to another. Our

systematic approach does. For example, consider inconsistent action–the generic solution to that is easy–just be consistent! Classical time managers give us some ideas and rules to follow for time management, but I think it behooves us to think about systematically applying indirect techniques so that we take "a little nip" out of various time-wasters as we practice our regular routines. This way, we don't have to remember a "bunch of tricks."

Self-Management

Self-management, as far as I'm concerned, is the cornerstone of good time management. Consider characteristics of managers. Very few are able to work more than a few minutes at a time on a single project. Many have many different things to do in a day, each requiring several minutes of concentrated activity. Another characteristic is that very few have an uninterrupted period in which to plan, consider policies of the institution, and contemplate an appropriate philosophy of management. And if we, as presidents, don't think about the future, who is going to? Presidents, academic vice presidents, and deans typically are concerned with "this week." Appointment calendars are filled, not in accordance with the necessities of the institution, but rather with the will of the most energetic and bothersome persons in the organization. We tend to view "the boss as a bandmaster leading an orchestra"; but realistically, when all facts are considered, we're forced to view the "boss as a puppet on a string pulled by a crowd of unknown and unorganized people." In every organization I've been associated with, both in industry and in academia, whether as a quality control engineer or as an academic vice president, the same type problems arise.

Time log–One of the things that classical time managers suggest you begin with, if you are having trouble with time, is the preparation of a time log. As persons begin to log their time, the first startling fact uncovered is that their time allotments don't go where they think they do. A time log may seem mundane and mechanical, but it's often worth it. It's not enough for a manager to feel that there's not sufficient time to work along and plan: you really have to know where your time is going, and one of the best ways to know is to develop a time log. Mackenzie, *The Time Trap*, and other classical time managers give suggestions for how to build the log over a couple of week's time, how to analyze and evaluate the log, and then how to do something about it.

There are definite steps in taking time inventories. You should allocate your time, set daily goals with regard to what you want to do with that time, maintain a record of the time, and prepare a summary for a week or two. (By the way, this doesn't take much time.) Then, you can make a judgment on daily effectiveness with regard to what you did versus what you said you were going to do. Finally, you can make an informed evaluation of what you are doing with your time.

As the result of a time analysis, most managers find, after a couple of weeks, that much of their work is repetitive and can be routinized and delegated. There are many phone calls and visits that have no importance at all; there are many conversations with the same people on the same or similar subjects. (Approaches to routinizing and delegating will be covered later.) Thinking and planning seem to be fitted in only if there is time left over.

Through review of daily activities, the manager can easily determine who is taking the initiative in conversations, who is causing problems, and in effect, who the people are who are "pulling the strings of the puppet". Until these are identified and recognized, it is very difficult to do much effective time management.

Over 75 years ago the great American psychologist Karl Menninger wrote a scientific treatise on what, until then, had been generally thought of as a moral problem: how to develop good habits and how to break bad ones. It was almost the first application of science to the problems of human behavior, and that essay is as sound today as it was when it was written. As a matter of fact, time management depends on good habits, but getting to good habits is a major challenge.

Single handling—One of the classical solutions time managers give us is that of "single handling". This is a very important concept. Single handling involves the habit of taking the appropriate action the first time the opportunity presents itself. Usually, this happens when a document is first encountered in the in-basket. It does not mean that snap judgments are required: papers or problems which can't be dealt with because of insufficient information should be sent to an appropriate person. The implementation of this particular good habit requires great will power and practice. It's tough! Note an example. Many of us pick up a document from the in-basket and say to ourselves, "I really don't know what to do about that now so I'll lay it aside and read it again later". Then, we read it again later, only to say "I still don't know what to do about that". Then, we carry it in our briefcases for a while, and on and on. Before you know it, we have invested six or seven times as much time as we ought to spend on that kind of project. Either we knew how to solve it or we didn't. Either we had the information to solve it or we didn't. Thus, we should take some steps in the interim. Obviously, the generic solution is single handling. However, this is a pervasive solution—which is not easy. The relevant question becomes how we convert a generic solution such as single-handling to a habit. And, believe me, this is difficult! We can't attack the problem directly by simply saying "I am going to become a good single handler!" That would require a conscious thought for every situation until we had formed the habit—too much to ask of most managers. I contend that we must develop a systematic approach to augment and facilitate application of the suggestions of classical time managers. We will return to this later.

Planning

Planning is one of the two or three most important activities related to organization management. One of the things that most people overlook when they resist planning "because they don't have time" is the significant long-run time savings as well as performance improvement that can result from planning. These savings and improvements are not "theoretical." They are based on empirical evidence and have been demonstrated over and over again. Experiments around the world have shown that if you expend "reasonable" planning time, the total planning and execution time for a project will be in most cases less than the total time if you don't expend "reasonable" planning time.

The Pareto principle—Another very important principle in time management, in addition to planning, is the Pareto principle, which states that the significant items in a given group normally constitute a relatively small portion

36

of the total items in the group. Juran first used the terms "vital few" and "trivial many" to illustrate this principle. Empirical evidence is also available as testimony to the truth of this principle. Experiments as well as "real-world" examples repeatedly demonstrate that roughly 80 percent of the "total time spent" gives 20 percent of the results, which means that 20 percent of "total time spent" gives 80 percent of the results.

The PERT process—It is important to remember that no kind of management is going to be as good as it could be unless you really, truly believe that planning is the place where it begins—unless you really get into planning yourself. If we are to plan and prioritize properly, we need a systematic approach to planning. Of the many models available, I suggest the PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) process as one of the best and easiest to apply. This process is applicable in any situation in which there are activities that have to take place within tasks, all of which comprise a given project.

Getting Organized: Screening Interruptions

One of the classical time management difficulties is interruptions. There is a classical set of solutions called "screening interruptions." Many people refer to this solution as "blocking interruptions": that seems a bit too structured to me, so I prefer to use "screening interruptions" instead.

Interruptions are misleading. They frequently go unrecognized as such because they masquerade under what is referred to as a "presumption of legitimacy." As a key example of the presumption of legitimacy, consider the mail. It is not unusual for managers to assume that anything they receive in the mail is there by right, so they think that they have to get into it and take care of it themselves. There is also the presumption of legitimacy associated with telephone calls: many managers accept phone calls in the middle of a conversation with another person in their office. In fact, it's astonishing that many persons who would not dream of breaking into an office and intruding on a personal conversation think that they have the inherent right to interrupt by means of a phone call. Presumption of legitimacy is also attached to the "drop-in" visit.

There are all kinds of presumptions of legitimacy floating around in any organization and, if we are going to be good time managers, we are going to have to hold those to a minimum. Note that I did not say that we have to strive to eliminate them completely. That is virtually impossible. But I surely recommend that we hold them to a reasonable minimum.

Classical time managers talk about managing incoming calls, managing outgoing calls, and curtailing all calls. With regard to the latter, the first sentence in a conversation, classical time managers tell us, dictates a great deal about what is going to happen about that call timewise.

Perhaps one of the most needed solutions for most managers is to avoid unnecessary and undue socializing. Appropriate managing of visits in the office is important; and closing the open door at least partially is important if we are going to talk about minimizing interruptions and the effect they have on us.

Notice the pervasiveness of the time problems and solutions about which we have talked so far. It's easy to say, "manage you incoming calls" and "manage visits to your office appropriately." All of us would agree that both are necessary; but, if you manage them too loosely, you don't have any time, and, if you manage them too strictly, you don't have any friends. So there is

a balance that we must strike in attacking time-wasters. If you are having problems, I refer you to the classical literature in time management for specific hints on "balance" and other related aspects.

A major difficulty that people have with specific time management suggestions is that some look like gimmicks . Others, some gimmicks and some not, are just as hard to pull off because they involve habits; and changing habits is very difficult. All of these concepts add to my reasons for saying that a systematic, organization-wide approach is the best solution to time management problems for individuals, for units, and for organizations.

Getting Organized: Managing Meetings

The roles that people play in meetings are very illuminating. There are, as illustrations, the "agressor," the "blocker," the "devil's advocate" (who is less advocate than devil), and the "playboy" (who, for example, exhibits cynicism and nonchalance). The better we understand people and their roles in meetings, as we get into the behavioral aspects as well as the systematic set of approaches, the better we can prepare for, conduct, and follow up meetings. The better we manage meetings, the better our overall time management; the better our time management, the more time we have for whatever else we want to do—play golf, think long-term about our institutions, etc.

There are some rules that Mackenzie and other classical time managers talk about in preparing for meetings, conducting meetings, and following up meetings. Generally, there are approximately 20 for managing meetings. Most of those rules are applicable in most of our situations, but you would never know this by viewing many typical meetings. We spend extensive time on some policy, complete with joke, and get no closure; then, we come back at another meeting and start all over again on the same policy issue, sometimes with the same joke. Even if we get closure in the second meeting, and someone is directed to take care of it, we may not follow up on it—because we typically can't remember all the projects we are "juggling" at a given time. This kind of thing happens much more often than we want to admit—I again refer you to the classical time managers for good specific solutions to these kinds of problems.

Delegation

We talk a lot about delegation, but in most cases very few of us do a great deal about it. There is far too little discussion of delegation, even in professional management courses, so many managers have difficulty in grasping the concept of delegation as a vital tool. This omission is a serious error for there is a vast difference between "just delegating" and grasping delegation as a vital and appropriate tool.

Managing is broadly defined as getting things accomplished through people; and delegation is giving people things to do. Therefore, the precise statement should be: One who cannot delegate effectively cannot manage effectively.

Leader types—There are three basic types of leaders. There are the working leaders who delegate very little and are still performing tasks which are carry-overs from previous jobs. We don't want to turn loose those things we did before, and, as a result, we may accomplish very little long-range planning because we're involved in some things which are no longer any of our business.

There are the delegators with no control who delegate extensively, but, in so doing, almost completely abdicate control. These leaders accomplish very little informed long-range planning. Finally, there are the delegators with control who delegate intelligently without abdicating, and who accomplish effective long-range planning much more often than the other two types of leaders. It is important that managers strive to move from categories one and two into category three, because in delegating appropriately, without losing control, without abdicating responsibility, we automatically are accomplishing many of the things it takes to be a good, classical time manager.

Time allocation—Another very important principle is concerned with time allocation. "How much should be delegated?" is a classical question. The problem is affected in at least two ways by management level. First, the ideal ratio between managing and operating varies directly with management level. Second, the kind of organization, the kind of industry, and even the kind of people you have in any organization determine the amount that should be delegated.

It is, however, a general principle that the higher you move in an organization the more you should be involved in managing and the less you should be involved in operating. Therefore, for a first-line supervisor (a department chairman, for example) we would expect about 30 percent of the time to be spent in managing and 70 percent of the time in operations; for a middle manager, 50 percent each; for an executive manager, 70 percent managing and 30 percent operations; for a chief executive officer, about 90 percent managing and only 10 percent operating. I doubt that many of us meet these ground rules—even those of us who would like to strive for such. However, where you should delegate in an organization and how you should delegate are important questions.

The classic statement says that you should delegate in an organization to that level where the individual to whom you delegate has the appropriate expertise and information to solve the problem. Yet this is another one of the pervasive solutions that is not at all easy to apply. How do you know who is the right person? We have found that our systematic approach to self, unit, and organization management helps us, within our philosophy of management, to find that solution over and over—easily. It also helps greatly with the right amount of delegation versus managing.

Reverse delegation—Reverse delegation is a classical problem which abounds everywhere. It is an interesting phenomenon in manager-subordinate relations. First let's consider why this kind of problem exists. Sometimes the subordinate wishes to avoid risk, or is afraid of criticism. The subordinate may lack confidence or the necessary information and resources to accomplish the job; or the boss may want to be needed or be unable to say "no" to the requests of all those people who "pull the strings" in the organization. All of these things encourage reverse delegation. It occurs every day to far too great an extent.

Let me give you a scenario. You come into the office in the morning, having found a parking place; you stroll down the hall—everything is rosy. You have your priorities laid out—you've learned that planning and prioritizing are very important to you, so on the way to work you have planned and prioritized and you know the six big things you are going to get done today. In the hall you meet someone with "that look". You know you shouldn't

do it, but you cannot avoid making the first mistake: saying "good morning". That's only a "wee" mistake, but next you make the critical mistake of also saying "How are you?" Of course, he or she is just dying to tell you: "I've been wanting to talk to you about that. I just happened to have this little 'monkey' on my back." And so you say, "Goodness, let me hear about that monkey." So far you are guilty of only one "wee" mistake and two critical ones. Your catastrophic mistake occurs when you say, after you have heard about the monkey, "Let me think about it." Now you have the "monkey," a problem which doesn't come close to fitting into your six priorities.

The end of the story may not come here. You may round the corner and repeat the scenario with another person who reports to you. Worse still, it doesn't end here! The person who has given you the first monkey may acquire someone else's monkey in the same way before he or she can get to his/her office. It is easy to see that continuing repetitions of the scenario will (and too often does) lead to the situation in any organization where everyone is "foolin' with someone else's monkey".

Of course, some of you are perhaps such innately good managers that you may automatically make the appropriate response, that is, you may say, "I don't want that monkey". You may also think that you are maintaining the appropriate balance and that you need to take monkeys occasionally just to show people that you are still capable of feeding them. Even so, the rules for monkeys, from classical time management, include: they should be fed or shot; the monkey population should be kept below the available feeding time; monkeys should be fed only by appointment, not in hallways; and, if they are internal monkeys, they should be fed face to face or by telephone—not by mail. Each monkey needs to be assigned a degree of initiative and a next feeding time. In short, in addition to planning, following up, single handling, etc., we need to prioritize so that we can continue to stay on top of our projects.

Working with Subordinates' Time

The question of working with subordinates' time is another classical time management problem. We have to worry about working with subordinates' time if we are to be very good as self-managers, unit managers, and organization managers. We have to keep the solutions to our own time problems from adding to similar problems of our subordinates. If we become good time managers, and learn to plan, prioritize, and not take monkeys, we may virtually destroy subordinates because, now, they would have to keep their own monkeys– while possibly still accepting monkeys from other people. If we are really going to be successful at time management, it is necessary that we work out a philosophy and scheme of time management for the entire organization. This can't be accomplished without a great deal of thought, planning and interaction.

There are some hints, and some fairly good details, that classical time managers give us along these lines. You should encourage subordinates to practice time management concepts. Work with them, for example, to make a time long—that is, of course, if you decided to do one for yourself and it has been beneficial. If you are not interested enough, your subordinates seldom will be! You should also, for example, require follow through. Projects are like children: you shouldn't make assignments if you are not going to follow up on them; you should not have rules if you are not going to enforce them.

Follow-up is terribly important for the morale and well-being of an organization.

Working with the Secretary and Staff

The last concept to which I will refer, and about which classical time managers talk considerably, is one of the most critical: working with the secretary and staff. Many of us don't realize how terribly we run the office until we have a chance to see one that is well run. Although most of us would say that we have super secretaries and our offices are running very well, there are some classic difficulties that occur with most of us. We don't have time to do the really "great things" in our organizations because we are inundated with things the secretary is doing wrong, not doing, or doing that she shouldn't be doing. The secretary is one of the critical resources contributing to the manager's effectiveness. There must be a team relationship; the classical time managers give us good advice on appropriate approaches.

Time Management – Summary Comments

In Mackenzie, as in other classical time management literature, there are summaries of "what to do". There are listings of the classical time management problems, the possible causes, and related solutions. Many of these, however, are far too general in nature to allow easy application or else so specific and/or "gimmicky" that they do not lend themselves to transfer among or broad applicability to generic time management problems. For example, lack of planning is a classical time-waster; the solution is easy – just *plan!* Similarly, if there is a lack of priorities, the solution is to *prioritize!*

It is very important to note again that I am not encouraging you to have *any specific* time management philosophy. However, I would encourage you, if you are having problems with, for example, priorities, to consider classical time management concepts and principles and then develop your own philosophy. Then you will be faced with a very significant task, finding some way of implementing that philosophy. Indeed, one of the greatest difficulties associated with classical time management is that related mechanisms are so difficult to apply with even reasonable consistency. It's not unusual for a person to go to a two-day seminar and pick up 100 super ideas on time management specifics, but, by the time the person returns to the office, the ideas which ultimately are applied may be reduced to three or four. Actually, if persons attend a classical time management seminar and effectively apply two or three really good principles out of classical time management, they have done a much better than average job.

I suggest that if there is interest in time management, to the extent that an individual is willing to develop a time management philosophy for himself or herself, or even for the organization, there are better ways than those proposed by classical time management experts for implementing those philosophies.

Two Systems to Implement Time Management Principles

As indicated earlier, I shall begin with "attacking time-wasters systematically". Classical time management is difficult unless we have some systematic approach. At Southwest Texas we have developed a system based on the 4BMAP (4 Basic Management and Administrative Procedures) system.

The principles and applications of our system are easy – but they take a *great deal* of commitment.

The 4BMAP system–The 4BMAP system is a pragmatic approach, available for, and capable of, minimizing time-wasters. Although at Southwest Texas we have greatly augmented the system, it is fair to say that we obtained several of our original ideas from it.

The reasons for using a system like 4BMAP, or ours, is to help unchain us from our desks and day-to-day crisis management and to allow us to get to the "magic door" with the good solutions behind it. Such a system can help give us time to plan and talk about priorities. It can help managers delegate rather than abdicate, as well as increase personal output and effectiveness–and simultaneously provide more discretionary time. It can help us develop a simple, efficient communication system for developing and issuing policies and instructions with continuity. Such a systematic approach to time management can be both effective and simple as we discover inefficiency, bottlenecks, and other problems in institutional operations and make corrections that are *permanent.*

(By the way, systematic approaches do not preclude a feeling for people, a feeling for public relations, or interest in having things go smoothly in terms of people-to-people relations. Often in academia we have a tendency to dichotomize, to put people in mutually exclusive categories. For example, when we start a search for a chairperson, there are some faculty members who may say, "Which shall we get, an academician or an administrator?" as if it were impossible to have a single person satisfy both criteria. Or, we talk about a president who is good in development or a president who is a good internal manager. I fail to appreciate those kinds of dichotomies; I believe that we ought to be as good as we can in *all* categories.)

The 4BMAP concept can be stated in one sentence: "The four basic management and administrative procedures provide a vehicle for efficient management so that both demand and routine responsibilities can be promptly met and that time will be available for discretionary action." We have no other responsibilities except demand and routine, so if we can handle those and simultaneously have more discretionary time, it must be a good approach. In the original sense, there are four subsystems to this system: there is a project committee subsystem in which we generate policy and procedure; an operating letter system in which we document group policy and procedure; job procedures in which we document procedure for a single person; and detailed operation reviews in which we regularly review to see that the other subsystems are working properly and, of course, to improve them from time to time.

At Southwest Texas, we have reduced these four basic subsystems to two, so we talk about an operating letter system and a job procedure system (job procedures are not to be confused with job descriptions).

Job Procedure System

Because this system is so simple and easy, you might think we are all naive for not having invented and used it every day. Indeed, there is nothing sophisticated at all about this system. Rather, we are talking about *effective* systems for accomplishing those things we have already set as goals of classical time management: self-management, planning, screening interruptions,

managing meetings, delegation, working with subordinates' time, and working with the secretary and staff. Simple, yes; simplistic, no.

The problems we typically encounter in an organization include the problems of waste-time, and the confusion and frustration encountered when new or reassigned nonmanagement personnel take on new jobs. The effects of these are staggering. For example, the loss of a clerk in an office force causes confusion, needless telephone calls, and delays in getting reports. The immediate supervisor generally finds it difficult to train new employees. Often company or institutional training courses designed for specific duties and functions are not even available. Work may be performed by personal preference based on past experience; or changes may be hard to put into effect and new instructions may have little permanency. Experienced and seemingly efficient employees may be wasting time through duplication of effort and trial and error introduction of required changes. Typical excuses range from "I was away on vacation" to "It wasn't typed that way on the rough draft" to "I wasn't hired to do that" to "What memo?".

Job procedures tell: "what" in precise detail; "how" with reference to source of authority; "when," including specific time commitments; and "who" by identifying by title the person designated as responsible. They go a long way toward eliminating the causes for these kinds of excuses.

The major purpose of job procedures is to improve the accuracy and efficiency of each individual's work. Job procedures provide ready references; they cause employees to become productive immediately; because specific job requirements and procedures are spelled out in the job procedures, much less of the boss's time is required in indoctrinating new employees; and employees can determine what to do at the proper time without specific directions. We solve many of the problems of "monkey-passing" through using job procedures.

To illustrate, I want to relate what happened in my office at Southwest Texas. Very early in my presidency there was one secretary and an administrative assistant in the office. At that time, I hated to take a trip: not only were the hotel reservations sometimes duplicated or nonexistent, but when I returned there was "that stack of mail". So I called the two into my office and said, "If we tried to be any more inconsistent, I don't know how we could do it." They agreed. I asked them to write down the steps for any one job function of theirs. When the secretary brought hers back, my notion that everyone thought sequentially was forever dispelled. I graded the steps just like an English theme, (giving poor grades, incidentally), marked them up to make them sequential and more nearly exhaustive, gave the steps back, and asked them to straighten the steps out, critique each others, and put the steps in final form before bringing them back. The improvement was significant. The three of us repeated the exact cycle for two more job functions (a job defined as having a definite beginning, a finite set of sequential steps, and a definite ending). This time the initial work was much better, resulting in grades roughly equivalent to C's. The third repeat of the entire cycle resulted in initial efforts to which I gave grades of A's. We were all proud of the results and the process.

I next asked them to make a list of *all* the job functions that they had. In a week they had a list of some 86 job functions. Next, I asked them to write the steps for each of those functions, one per day. Actually, they averaged

only one every three days, however, their efforts, with a little extra initiative, resulted in job procedures books complete with indexes. When the secretary left SWT to take another position, we hired a new one from the biology department. My administrative assistant told her to read the book before beginning work. For a day she did; and the second day, after a few questions, she was virtually as productive as the previous secretary on her last day. We found this to be the case repeatedly. Testimonies abound. Due in good part to proficiency with the job procedure system, the secretary (to whom I have just referred) advanced quickly, moving to administrative assistant for one of our vice presidents less than 18 months after leaving the position of secretary I in the biology department. Indeed, the job procedure system changed our lives.

No one else in the University was encouraged to do this, and we simply kept the procedures in the President's office. But the time it saves, the hurt feelings it saves, make it worth the trouble for anyone. The first few job procedures written saved enough time when the functions had to be performed, that we were ahead in accumulated time after only three had been written.

To further illustrate job procedures, let me tell you that there are 38 steps in getting me ready for a trip. Here are the first few of the written steps that appear in the appropriate job procedure:

- When LHo is going on a trip, he tells me where he's going, what city he has to visit, when he wants to be there and back; whether he needs to rent a car; whether there are any other special arrangements.

- I make a pop-up note to remind me to make an absence memo one week prior to his departure; a pop-up note to check the calendars and reschedule any standing meetings that will need to be cancelled because of the upcoming trip; and a pop-up note to remind me to review his trip folder three days prior to his departure and to pull his next trip-to folder at the right time.

Of course, these are not all, but they indicate some of the subtleties with the job procedure system—and with the pop-up system (which is a tickler file).

I've also done job procedures for myself. For Board meetings I have only 10 steps in preparing, but they are very important. My administrative assistant, on the other hand, may have 200.

At first, I thought vice presidents were too sophisticated to work with job procedures, but that attitude doesn't exist anymore. In fact, it's amazing what you learn by asking vice presidents simply to list their job functions. It is very difficult to do, but it is downright illuminating for an organization to make such lists.

We have found that it helps to break the job functions down according to frequency of required conduct: daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly, biannually. We also have a list of *demand* events. Not surprisingly, it's the longest list we have.

Before I go on to the next system, I want to reiterate that the process, including the thinking that goes into developing the job procedures, is perhaps

as important as the job procedures themselves. We do not have time for me to get into the many subtleties, details, and advantages of the job procedure system. That is the subject of much of the two-day seminar to which I previously referred. However, I can tell you in all candor that it has had one of the greatest impacts on my professional career of all the systems I have encountered.

The Operating Letter System

The operating letter system is the most exciting part of the 4BMAP system. On the surface it is much like the job procedure system; the operating letter system also tells what, how, who, when, where, and sometimes why. It standardizes procedures for local correspondence by providing direction and information, with an index and numbering system for easy identification and control by the person responsible for automatic updating and/or cancellation.

There are two major differences between the operating letter system and the job procedure system. An operating letter deals with *both* policy and procedure, but the job procedure deals only with procedure. (We have not made any attempt to separate policy and procedures in our operating letters, even though classical industrial engineers tell us that we should do that.) The second difference is that operating letters deal only with commitment and agreement from *more than one* person. Therefore, we make our differentiation on the critical criterion of numbers of persons involved from whom you would like to evoke commitment, rather than on policy versus procedures. If you want commitment from only one, you put it in a job procedure by listing the things that a person does on a given job function. If you want commitment from two or more, you put it in an operating letter, whether it's policy or procedure, or a combination of both.

You may be able to identify with "the straw that broke the camel's back," the straw that finally made us commit to the operating letter system. During a deans' council meeting, one of the deans said he thought there ought to be a new policy for "dead" week—the end of semester week. Everyone agreed, but when we tried to find out what the old policy was, one dean described it one way, a second yet another way, and a third still another way. A fourth dean agreed with the first, a fifth with the second, and a sixth with the third. Three different stories on what the policy was were corroborated, all within five minutes. We looked further, into our publications, and found still varying versions spelled out: one in the faculty handbook, one in our suggestions-for-students publication, one in our catalog. That is, we encountered a perfect example of *"ambiquity of expectations"*.

All the deans agreed that we needed a systematic approach for identifying, generating, promulgating, disseminating, storing, retrieveing, updating, and implementing policies and procedures at our institution. What evolved from that need has turned out to be a "way of life" for self, unit, and organization management. It is as powerful as any system I've ever seen in my years in industry, or in academia, or anyplace else. It may not be *better*, but it is potentially more *powerful* because of the things that have evolved.

The philosophy of our operating letters (policies and procedures) is different in major ways from that associated with other policy and procedures

manuals, for example, the General Motors manual. I will point out examples of these differences as I identify aspects of our system.

To further illustrate the need for such a system, remember that one of the major aspects of the job of a manager involves appropriate issuance of local instructions. Generally we use oral and letter instructions, which is all right for short-range compliance but not at all adequate for long-range compliance. Oral instructions are often misinterpreted; they are easily forgotten; or they are completely ignored. The most you can say about letter instructions is that they are far superior to oral instructions. Letter instructions become ineffective with the passage of time: they can be destroyed, filed away, forgotten, or completely outdated. Sometimes even the boss forgets and writes contradictory instructions. Because of the shortness of corporate memory and the ambiguity of expectations—those major enemies to management—a state of confusion ensues in local instructions. Time and effort are wasted in searching files, unnecessary calls, hurt feelings, etc.

The answer is to set up an easily understood and applied system to disseminating local instructions. The objectives of our system (which are not untypical of systems of this nature) are to provide standard procedure at the local operating level; give information, direction, and easy subject identification; and clearly note the person responsible and specific time for automatic update and/or cancellation. The same problems in organizations that lead to the need for job procedures also lead to the need for operating letters.

Operating letter system strengths—One of the strengths of the operating letter system versus the usual system is that operating letters provide *detailed* instructions whereas formal company or institutional instructions are sometimes broad. Another strength is that operating letters assign specific responsibility and keep the information current. Further, operating letters provide standard procedures, and, because they provide a specific time to update the letters, subject matter does not become outdated. Equally important, the operating letter system identifies where specific subjects can be found.

The operating letter system is working very well throughout Southwest Texas University. Of course, some people are now complaining that "it's raining policy and procedure": that happens when you introduce new systems. What they don't stop to think about is that they are comparing this system to Utopia, not with what we had. It was raining policy and procedures before, but different policies and procedures existed in different people's minds with little agreement on what the policies and procedures were.

Introduction and Improvement—So far, I have discussed self-management only as it relates to time management, with the job procedures. With introducing and implementing an operating letter system, I am going to talk about unit and organization management simultaneously as sometimes it is hard to separate them.

If you introduce an operating letter system for managing policy and procedure, there are certain things that need to be covered in an introductory document:

- Purpose
- Format
- Who has the authority to write and sign operating letters
- How and when operating letters will be issued

- How operating letters will be updated revised, or cancelled
- The numbering plan for filing and retrieval
- Distribution—including how to obtain additional copies and forms (if any are associated with the operating letter).

At Southwest Texas, the system was introduced with a 16-page document, to which I will refer in covering the topics.

Purpose—The operating letter system is intended to eliminate confusion in correspondence, reduce telephone inquiries, and so forth. It is important to note that each operating letter begins with a statement of the purpose of the letter.

Format—As noted above, each operating letter begins with a section on the purpose of the letter so that we know why we have any particular operating letter. All operating letters consist of at least four major sections. The first is purpose; the second one deals with who reviews it and when; the next sections include operating details; and the final section spells out the major responsibilities associated with the specific operating letter. A summary of responsibilities is also included, which removes anxieties and has proved very beneficial. You don't even have to read the whole operating letter to see whether you have any responsibilities within it.

Who has the authority to write and sign operating letters—In no case is an operating letter signed and distributed except by the person having authority over all administrative units affected by the operating letter. Operating letters may be proposed by any individual or group; rough drafts can be prepared and forwarded through appropriate administrative channels.

How and when operating letters will be issued—Any manager of any unit must be responsible for the development of policy and procedure. In fact, I view such development as one of *my* major responsibilities.

At Southwest Texas, anybody can propose policy and procedure for the university. In order to be introduced, a potential policy and procedure must come up through channels and be sponsored by one of the vice presidents at the Executive Council. [Note that as soon as we force people to bring agenda items in the form of an operating letter, we are getting them to bring *solutions* and not *problems.*] When such a proposed letter is brought to a meeting of the Executive Council, I simply and quickly assign two dates, typically four or five weeks ahead, on a Friday and a following Monday. The Friday deadline says that each of the other vice presidents is expected (if he wants to) to have written comments ready for the vice president who sponsored the proposed operating letter. This means that the other vice presidents will go back and deal with the people in their areas which this particular policy might affect in order to get comments from them (to be put into writing). This eliminates many of the problems associated with the "roles" that people play at meetings. It also means that in four weeks the sponsoring vice president has written comments from each of the other vice presidents; thus, the proposed operating letter is on the following Monday meeting agenda, which has been automatically set according to the second deadline mentioned above.

By the way, we have a written groundrule that a VP is not allowed to take comments from his people and simply pass them on: he has to endorse them, to modify them, or, in some way, to interact, react, analyze, and make a

commitment. If one of the vice presidents has failed to provide his comments—because he inadvertently neglected to—we give him two days. That vice president is then not likely to make that mistake again because he has to face up to everyone in his division and say that there is potential legislation pending and they have only two days to respond, whereas other divisions have had four weeks. This enforces good participation.

At the following Monday meeting, another date is assigned to the proposed operating letter, between three to five weeks hence. At that date, the "operating letter package" is due to me. In that package there is to be the original proposed document, all the comments that were received from the other vice presidents, and a new proposed operating letter from the proposing vice president which attempts to accommodate the other vice presidents without destroying the rigor and integrity of the OL as originally proposed.

In terms of receiving everything that really matters and eliminating all those things that don't really matter, in terms of getting down to the bare bones of a given situation, this exercise is superb. Now, with the completed package, I can go to my quiet hour (which we arrange religiously through the job procedures) and make the decision on policy and procedure—often in 10 or 15 minutes. If there are some contentions, however, we call a special meeting to discuss them—but even in such cases, the matter already will be boiled down to the *critical* issues at that point.

How operating letters will be updated, revised, or cancelled—The review section is very important. We have specific ways for reviewing all policy and procedure for the university. A single person is designated as having the responsibility for reviewing each specific operating letter at a specific time. For example, in the OL introducing the entire system, i.e., OL 01.01, we say that the OL will be reviewed in April of each year by the president. This leaves *no* ambiguity whatsoever.

Other Sections of OL 01.01

Time limits coverage of all the aspects of either the OL which introduced the policy system, or the entire OL system itself. Let me simply note that the major topics covered in the introductory OL include (1) Purpose, (2) Reviews of Operating Letters (How Operating Letters will be Updated, Revised or Canceled), (3) Format, (4) How and When Operating Letters will be Issued, (5) Letter Issuance and Revision Authority, (6) Operating Letter Number and Distribution Plan, (7) Policy vs. Procedure, (8) Filing, (9) Distribution, (10) Additional Copies of SWT/OLs, (11) Numbering Forms, (12) Implementation of the OL System by the Vice Presidnets, (13) Responsibility for Carrying Out Instructions of all SWT/OLs, (14) Authority Invoked by SWT/OLs, (15) Transition.

I should add another major point. Had we sufficient time for me to go through SWT/OL 01.01 in detail, I could easily show you seven or eight major strengths which this policy and procedure system affords over similar systems currently existing in business, education, government, etc. In fact, I could show you that it is not merely a system for managing policy and procedure but, in fact, represents a "way of life" at SWT. That is, we use this system to establish and enforce the *entire* philosophy of management at our institution. For example, we believe strongly in participative management. I believe that you can easily see from our method of introducing and updating OL's

that we use the entire system as a device for enhancing participative management to the best possible extent throughout our organization.

Summary

With the job procedure system representing our "self management" system, and with the OL system representing our "unit/organization management" system, I believe it is clear that these two subsystems afford a self/unit/organization management system. Finally, we could not find a single one of the classical time wasters that could not be attacked effectively and systematically by means of one or both of the systems. Thus, we claim, that the collective result of our job procedures and operating letters is indeed a *systematic approach to self/unit/organization time management.*

49